

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

PUBLIC LIBRARY  
MAR 10 1954

DETROIT

VOL. XIV, No. 3

MARCH 8, 1954

\$2.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

## When The Church Speaks Out

In the past few months there have been some notable instances in American Protestantism of willingness to "speak out" concerning the spiritual situation in our country today. Perhaps the most notable of these has been the "Letter to Presbyterians" issued on November 2 by the General Council of that denomination. Fortunately, the content of this letter was made available to the press as well, so that its impact has been widespread. The reaction to it forms an interesting, and sometimes disturbing, case study of what happens when a prophetic note is sounded in modern Protestant life.

The letter itself was a "family affair," from the General Council of the denomination (26 men and women, 18 of whom are elected from the church at large) to the presbyteries, and the ministers and officers of the individual churches. It was an attempt to speak to the church, following a mandate from the General Assembly that the General Council should "cultivate and promote the spiritual welfare of the whole Church," and to state positively, from a theological base, certain concerns about the present situation in the United States and the rest of the world.

Briefly, what the letter did was this. An introductory section stressed the danger and menace of communism, underlined clearly the need for precautions to prevent its spread, and acknowledged the contribution which Congressional committees had made in this area. However, it went on to point out that in the course of this necessary activity, new perils were being compounded out of the old, specifically the "subtle but potent assault upon basic human rights," the fact that some (not all) Congressional inquiries give the impression that "treason and dissent are being confused" (this several months before the recent spate of Lincoln Day speeches), and the indiscriminate way in which attacks are being made upon citizens of integrity and social passion. (The recent J. B. Matthews articles in *American Mercury*,

although not specifically cited, are a case in point.) A particularly significant insight of the letter was the concern of the General Council at the sheerly negative way in which communism is being fought in this country, and the consequent danger that in purging this demon, America may be creating a spiritual vacuum into which seven other demons can rush. (Those failing to catch the scriptural allusion at this point might look at *Matthew 12:43-45*.) In this discussion communism was identified as something "which is at bottom a secular religious faith of great vitality."

On the basis of that introductory analysis, the body of the letter then suggested three basic principles which must contribute to the situation.

1. The Christian Church has a prophetic function to fulfill in every society and in every age.
2. The majesty of truth must be preserved at all times and at all costs.
3. God's sovereign rule is the controlling factor in history."

It is hard to see how exception could be taken to these statements, and, as a matter of fact, in ensuing discussion of the letter, few critics have taken issue with this part of the letter. However, the General Council wisely and necessarily tried to spell out the implications of these principles—something which was certainly necessary if the letter was to do more than list lofty and unassailable generalities. The letter pointed out under the second item, for example, that falsehood is being accepted for its propaganda value, that truth is being suppressed if it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and that we are thus in the dangerous position of fighting communism with its own weapons of fear and expediency. It was further suggested, under the third point, that revolutionary forces can be a judgment of God upon our complacency. The letter pleaded for a recognition

of the fact that hate must not become our guiding motive, and that there is always the need for face-to-face encounter with our enemies around the conference table. The concluding paragraphs contained a plea for recognition of the United Nations as the "best available agent for international cooperation and the settlement of disputes among nations," and urged support of it, since "it stands between us and war."

While this bare summary cannot do justice to the letter, it can at least give some idea of its contents. What, then, has been the reaction to it? Much reaction has been favorable. The *New York Times* gave the letter page one billing, and high editorial praise, as did many other papers across the country. Other papers, particularly the Scripps-Howard chain, unleashed their editorial fury against it. The letters which were received by the Philadelphia office of the General Assembly were, on balance, much more favorable than critical.

Nevertheless, there has been a not insignificant protest against the letter, and the lessons to be learned from these protests are instructive. There has, for example, been some inter-necine warfare on the part of certain Presbyterian sessions and individuals, who have claimed that the General Council has no right to speak for the church. A careful reading of the letter, however, makes clear that the letter was designed only to speak to the church, and not to commit the church as such to its contents. In the face of this fact, mutterings about "papal bulls" on the part of certain elements within the denomination are not only irrelevant, but malicious.

A more disturbing type of protest has arisen in many quarters, to the effect that there is naivete if not duplicity in the suggestion that communism is a kind of religious faith; since communism is obviously pagan, anti-God, materialistic, and all the rest, no person who had not been "taken in" could call it a religion. Now the disturbing fact about such a protest is the revelation it gives of the immense gap between the thinking of most responsible Protestant leaders in recent years about communism, and the attitude represented by the protest. Clearly vast segments of the laity, and a smaller proportion of the clergy, have been untouched by the almost wearisome repetition of the contention that communism, as something demanding total commitment, is a form of religious faith, and that precisely what makes it so potent and so dangerous is that it is a pseudo-religion, a form of idolatry, a perverse substitute for the true God, to which people must com-

mit themselves without reserve. The theologians and the more informed clergy have obviously failed to communicate at this point, and such reactions as have just been cited are a judgment upon all concerned.

This fact suggests another kind of danger in the wind. It would be extremely unfortunate if controversy over the letter developed a clergy-lay split, the former (with some unhappy exceptions) supporting, and the latter attacking, the letter. There are indications that a group of laymen may try to make an issue of the letter at the next Presbyterian General Assembly, to force some modification of the powers of the General Council, as a kind of public chastisement. Let it therefore be stated categorically that nothing could be more unfortunate than subsequent temporizing with the tone and content of the letter, by an implied vote of "no confidence" in its signers. While exception may be taken by individuals to a phrase here or there, the statement as a whole is probably the most vigorous and forthright we have yet had from any church about the precarious state of our national health.

Those who are not Presbyterians have an obligation to give support to the letter in every way at their disposal, as well as those belonging to the denomination which issued it. Otherwise, the net result might become another tragic instance of the dangerous trend toward conformity against which the letter warns, and a failure to acknowledge the fact that prophetic witness must always stand at the heart and center of the Christian faith.

R. M. B.

#### Editorial Notes

Professor Brown in his editorial calls attention to the danger that there may develop a very general cleavage between ministers and laymen as a result of the wave of hysteria of which McCarthyism is a symptom. There is evidence that this cleavage is already present in many denominations. Of course there are many laymen who are as much opposed as any ministers to these developments but in local situations it is often the minister who feels quite isolated. An investigation in the Rochester area showed that eighty-five percent of the ministers regard the work of Senator McCarthy as a serious threat to America, while the public opinion polls indicate that over half of the people in the country as a whole believe that the Senator is on balance an asset even though they do not approve of his methods. Between those who are on opposite sides of that issue communication is becoming extremely difficult.

There is one factor here which puts a great responsibility on the minister: it is the fact that, compared with

most other citizens in the average community, he is in a better position to resist the pressure of the majority. He may not be more courageous as a person but he has more independence for many people recognize that he should have freedom of speech and that he is responsible to an authority beyond the community. He has some unit of the larger Church back of him. He can lose his job like anyone else but he is in a much less vulnerable position than the teacher who is responsible to the local school board or the business man whose economic security depends on the good will of the community. The other professional group which has a similar independence is the faculty of a college or university whose administrators and governing boards are dedicated to the preservation of academic freedom. We owe a great debt to such administrators and boards for often they have had to stand against a very strong current of opinion and they have recently received shocking insults on the radio. Sometimes in the local church there will be women who are more independent of these pressures than the men.

There is one professional group which in training and tradition should be able to act as a break on these pressures from the majority. Alexis de Tocqueville in his *Democracy in America*, written over a century ago, says that the legal profession because of its conservatism is a safeguard of the freedom of minorities. Today there are notable judges who perform this function. Also the voices from the law schools are usually on the side of civil liberties. But it is doubtful if the local

bar in the average community stands out as such against the majority. The fact that the American Bar Association supported the Bricker Amendment may not bear directly on this point but it does suggest that instead of representing a constructive conservatism, the lawyers are no more immune than anyone else to the hysteria of the times, in this case to a very reckless nationalism.

It is interesting that de Tocqueville traces the usefulness of the legal profession as a defender of minorities to its conservatism. This suggests that today we often get our words confused. In common speech it is often assumed that the more conservative a person is the more surely will he follow the leadership of the extremists of the McCarthy type. But those who follow in that line are the ones who are careless of our traditions. It is fortunate that we have many men in this country who would usually be counted conservative in another popular sense—in their attitude toward economic policies—but who are also conservative in their stalwart defense of the freedom of minorities. Many of these men are lawyers and bankers and business men and often they are members of the governing boards of the colleges and universities which have preserved academic freedom for their faculties and students. These men are not distributed very fairly among communities in the nation as a whole. Where they are to be found they can often do much to counteract the public clamor which threatens spiritual and intellectual freedom in so many communities.

J. C. B.

## Point Four Today

FRANK S. KETCHAM

RECENT reports about Point Four, the bold new program of technical assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world upon which our government embarked two years ago, have been disquieting to many Americans. Reorganization, reduction in force, new policy enunciations, and rumors of more drastic changes yet to come have created a climate of uneasiness. What does the present administration intend to do with Point Four? Will the government abandon the program to private voluntary agencies, perhaps even to private business enterprise? Are Point Four projects tied in with military commitments? Are heavy budget cuts in prospect? Such questions are being asked with increasing urgency by supporters of Point Four.

The attitude of the administration toward technical assistance can be discovered only by examining the statements of policy, as well as the actions, of its leaders. We have no other way of ascertaining their

intentions. Let us, therefore, take a look at the record.

*Statement of Policy.* On April 16, 1953, in a speech before the American Association of Newspaper Publishers, President Eisenhower voiced his basic philosophy with respect to foreign aid:

"We are prepared to reaffirm, with the most concrete evidence, our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous. This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world. . . . The monuments to this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health."

More recently, when Harold Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, addressed the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in an effort to enlist their support of the Point Four program he referred to the President's statement as "the basic philosophy in which we are engaged and which we hope and pray may be extended even beyond the present free areas, even beyond the Iron Curtain."

These pronouncements hardly sound like the words of men who are not committed to the technical assistance program and who would like to see it shelved. What about actions, then? What has been done and is being done to advance these high objectives? It is here that we enter an area of controversy engendered partly by misunderstanding, partly by differences of view.

*Reorganization.* On August 1, 1953, the technical assistance program was merged with the economic assistance and other non-military foreign aid programs in the newly created Foreign Operations Administration. Thus, technical assistance lost its identity as a separate program. F.O.A. field operations are organized on a regional basis, paralleling the organization of the Department of State, with regional directors responsible for the administration of all phases of economic and technical aid in four major areas, the Near East, Far East, Latin America and Europe.

The reorganization achieved economies which were urgently necessary because of reduced appropriations. At the same time it represents Mr. Stassen's approach to the problem of technical assistance, as expressed to the writer of this article in an interview. His concept of Point Four includes technical assistance and training with capital not merely to procure equipment for demonstration purposes but sufficient to get new projects started, to aid in the developmental stage. Under the former organizational plan, the attempt was made to draw a sharp line between technical assistance and economic considerations. Proponents of the new plan, including Mr. Stassen, maintain that the problems are not compartmental and that a certain amount of economic assistance is essential to the success of the technical assistance program. Mr. Stassen stated, in effect, that: "You can have the best of intentions with the technical assistance only approach, but if you don't tie it in with economics, the result is likely to be chaos, no matter how humanitarian your views are."

On the other hand, a feeling that is shared by many, including I may say myself, is that by the abolishment of technical assistance as a separate entity the door is open to a possible weakening of its

position as a continuing program. Should the perils of communist aggression be alleviated, programs intended for security are likely to be eliminated and along with them technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. Also, the combination of technical assistance with economic assistance, the latter including large amounts of special emergency assistance for such areas as Formosa and Indo-China where the communist threat is immediate, creates the false impression that technical assistance is much more expensive than it actually is, an impression which could have unfortunate repercussions in an economy-minded Congress.

*Reduction in Force.* The reorganization was accompanied by a reduction in staff. Over the objections of the administration, Congress appropriated \$14,000,000 less for administrative purposes in the F.O.A. than its constituent agencies received in the preceding year; moreover, the appropriation act contained stipulations requiring a reduction in personnel, particularly in the higher paid positions. As a result, a 30% cut was made in two principal areas: (1) Washington staff—administrative and program activities; (2) European missions in the more advanced countries. To meet the administrative problem, detailed supervision in the nation's capital has been reduced and the responsibility for missions and technicians in the field correspondingly increased.

There is no gainsaying the fact that through this retrenchment a great many able employees were lost to Point Four—employees who had been with the program since its inception and who were thoroughly imbued with its objectives and philosophy. To say that such a loss will not be felt is to fly in the face of logic. Yet the charge that those now directing the Point Four program are comparatively inexperienced is likewise unfair. The fact is that very little "new blood" has been brought into F.O.A., certainly no more than one would expect in connection with a change in administration.

*Role of Volunteer Agencies.* The present program contemplates expanded use of nongovernment agencies in the conduct of technical assistance. This proposal has been widely interpreted as indicative of a lack of interest in Point Four on the part of the administration and an intention to abandon it as a responsibility of government. The charge is serious, but is it supported by the record?

In his speech of November 12, 1953, before the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Mr. Stassen explained the decision to enlist a larger measure of their support:

"We have . . . reviewed the manner in which our Government had a relationship in the growth and

development of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities within the United States, and we have projected the unfolding development within the United States with all the allowances for the great differences to the problem that exists in the less developed areas of the world and the way in which the United States should exercise leadership, technical, economic, and cultural in the decade ahead.

*"We are prepared to enter into new, broad, long-term contracts with the land-grant colleges in the United States in relationship to specific underdeveloped countries and the educational institutions within those countries. We are prepared on the basis of three-year contracts to set agreed objectives of accomplishments, to set broad outlines of the method of program. . . . (Emphasis added.)*

"We have in mind activity in those areas in which the institution has demonstrated competence within the United States, having in mind that if an individual land-grant college in the United States could have with another less developed country and with educational institutions within that country a relationship that would include agriculture, and where appropriate, medicine, home economics, engineering, administrative and business services, . . . there would then develop the two-way flow between the individual country and the United States college with great progress and benefit to both being attained. We can develop with this the longer term approach that minimizes this annual one year hanging in the balance which must characterize governmental action. . . ."

In discussing this phase of his program with the writer, Mr. Stassen expressed substantially the same views, i.e., he is eager to translate conditions in the underdeveloped countries into the same conditions which were present when the United States made its own technical and social progress and he believes that the land-grant colleges, as well as other private institutions, have much to offer. He feels that non-government agencies can do a better job in many areas of technical assistance because they are in a position to develop a people-to-people relationship, rather than a government-to-government relationship, and also, because there will be less suspicion of a military or foreign policy angle. At no time did Mr. Stassen indicate a disposition to turn the whole program over to nongovernment auspices. He seemed rather to be expressing his own philosophy as to the manner in which the government should exercise leadership in mobilizing the resources of American institutions to get the job done.

In my opinion, the activities of F.O.A. thus far do not support the theory that it is abandoning Point Four. While plans for the negotiation of additional

contracts with private agencies are being pressed, there has been a 25% increase in the number of government technicians assigned to field work. This increase in technicians is in itself an accomplishment, in view of the extreme difficulty commented on by the International Development Advisory Board and others, of obtaining well qualified personnel for assignment to underdeveloped areas.

*Considerations of Security.* A conviction which the churches have repeatedly expressed and which has been voiced most recently by the I.D.A.B. is that technical assistance should never be conditioned upon the recipient countries' participation in military or defense support operations. While the possibility of a change in policy is one to be guarded against, there is no such requirement at present. All of the agreements include stipulations that the recipient nations will endeavor to promote international understanding and good will, maintain world peace, and mutually work to eliminate causes of international tension. Many agreements do contain promises as to mutual security where aid specifically related to mutual security is being furnished. But a nation does not have to agree to participate in programs which promote collective security in order to receive technical assistance from the United States. There are nations which are presently receiving a large measure of assistance from our government without commitments of a military nature.

India is the outstanding example of this neutralist position. Our foreign aid program in India is not tied in with military considerations; it is all economic and technical, aimed at improved living conditions. In India, technical assistance in agriculture, with consequent introduction of mechanical devices, had the effect of increasing unemployment in the cities. The economic and business side of Indian culture had lagged. This year F.O.A. is putting more money into India than ever before, "without any new strings attached," for the purpose of bringing forward the industrial side of Indian economy.

Another example of foreign aid without the military assistance requirement is to be found in Bolivia. In the past the welfare of the Bolivian people has been subject to variations in the tin market, and there has been acute economic distress. F.O.A. has moved to broaden the economic basis of aid to Bolivia by providing \$5,000,000 in wheat and \$4,000,000 in development capital.

The technical assistance program is basically one of mutual advantage to the United States and to the participating nations. It is to our advantage to aid the peoples of the underdeveloped areas which are still a part of the free world, to furnish leadership in connection with their social and technical advancement, in order that they may not become victims of

communist propaganda and in that way contribute to a movement which is abhorrent to our democratic institutions. Only in this broad sense are technical assistance projects inevitably related to questions of security.

*Budget Problems.* Continuance of Point Four is dependent upon the appropriation of funds by Congress. For the fiscal year 1955 the administration has requested a total of \$1,010,000,000 for economic and technical aid to foreign countries. The amount earmarked for technical assistance in the underdeveloped countries is about the same as the 1954 allotment. Proportionately, it is greater than before, when compared with the total estimate. In other words, while cuts have been recommended in some segments of the F.O.A. program, technical assistance is not among them.

According to one informed source, *the proposal for Point Four is closely scaled to the maximum which it is felt the recipient nations can absorb.* It is obvious that the administration wants to preserve the technical assistance program. Last year when a major reduction in appropriations was threatened by Congress, the President himself fought vigorously to save Point Four and the indications are that he will do the same again.

I may say that there is a feeling in some quarters that the South Asia problem is due for reexamination. A difference of opinion exists as to how much aid can be used effectively in India. Actually, the controversy relates to economic assistance or capital grants, and not to technical assistance in the narrow sense. There may be a reduction in the over-all budget for India, if the more conservative view is adopted.

Apparently there are still strong forces in Congress which favor the abolishment of F.O.A. as a separate organization and the transfer of its functions to the State, Defense, and Commerce Departments. A saving in overhead expense would be accomplished, but whether the distribution of responsibility for economic and technical assistance throughout these departments, the heads of which already have major duties in other broad fields, would be advantageous to the foreign aid program is highly questionable. The whole issue of organization seems likely to be aired again in the present session of Congress.

It is my feeling that the Eisenhower administration, i.e., the executive branch of the government, is sincere in its efforts to continue the technical assistance program, even to the point of requesting the maximum funds which can be used effectively. Well informed sources indicate strongly, however, that the legislative branch does not share in this enthusiasm for Point Four. The program just managed to come through the last Congress in the face of serious opposition and some reduction in appropriations. Strenuous efforts to trim the budget estimate which the President sent to Congress on January 21, 1954, are definitely in prospect. Under the circumstances, the American churches can be of great assistance to the administration in its efforts to carry out one of the great practical and humanitarian movements of our time by laying before the Congress their concern about Point Four and supporting the President, and others who are responsible therefor, in obtaining sufficient appropriations to do the job. *Direct representations to Congressmen and Senators should be made forcefully and soon.*

## CHURCH NEWS AND NOTES

### Polish Charges Refuted Here; U. S. Lutherans Not Warmongers

New York (NLC) — The first vice president of the Lutheran World Federation and president of the United Lutheran Church in America, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, has refuted charges of the Evangelical-Augsburg Church of (communist dominated) Poland that American Protestant church leaders support "a policy of frontier revision and preparation for war."

Replying to the Polish Lutheran charges which have been forwarded to church leaders all over the world by Bishop Karol Kotula of Warsaw, Dr. Fry also challenged the Polish Lutheran leaders:

1. To address "an equally outspoken remonstrance to the churches in the Soviet Union";
2. To prove the alleged "freedom of conscience and

confession" in communist ruled Poland by sending representatives to the Evanston, Ill., Assembly of the World Council of Churches of which the Evangelical-Augsburg Church of Poland is a member.

Dr. Fry's letter, just made public here, was dated January 18. It was a direct reply to a resolution adopted by the Council of Seniors of the Polish Lutheran Church at a conference in Warsaw last October. In the resolution the Polish seniors claimed that "legal action against a Polish bishop of the Roman Catholic Church is exploited in slanderous propaganda against the Polish Peoples Republic as proof of alleged persecution of the Church and religion." They added that it was their duty "to take a stand" in the matter "since Church leaders in some Western countries as well as individual faithful immigrants participate in this campaign." Stressing that "our Church and clergy cooperate with the State," the seniors specified that "the aggressive policy"

of the United States "provokes revisionistic efforts of Western Germany."

The resolution also "definitely condemned" the activities of a "group of Protestant ecclesiastic hierarchy (in America), which under cover of alleged defense of Christianity actually supports a policy of revision and preparation for war."

In his reply, Dr. Fry branded these accusations as false. He reminded the Polish bishop that "Lutherans, above all, should abstain from making untrue charges, remembering the explanation in the Smaller Catechism of God's commandment not to bear false witness against a neighbor," and added that "Unlike you, we have no need or occasion to be apologists for our nation." "As a fellow-Christian I regret that you have felt called upon to repeat accusations against the United States that are not verified and are not true," he went on.

Dr. Fry stressed that the Lutheran churches in America have never discussed the possible revision of Poland's western frontier which, according to the Polish Church's resolution, was created "as a result of a just historical verdict," but went on to ask of the Polish Lutheran leaders also to "regard the annexation of the age-old eastern regions of Poland by the Soviet Union as a just historical verdict."

He challenged the Polish Church to send delegates to the Evanston Assembly next summer because their presence "would give us an opportunity for candid and friendly Christian conversation in which I can disabuse your mind of many misconceptions." On the other hand, Dr. Fry stressed, "Your absence would be a visible evidence that the 'equality' of the churches in your land consists mainly in restrictions and not in normal exercise of religious liberty."

According to a recent official report from the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C., the Evangelical-Augsburg Church of Poland has more than 150,000 members in 253 parishes served by 95 clergymen. The Church's supreme council, which adopted the aforementioned resolution, is headed by Bishop Kotula who was elected to that post in 1951. At the time of Mr. Kotula's election reports were received here that Dr. San Szeruda, who had headed the Church since 1945, had relinquished his position because state authorities had intervened to urge his resignation.

### **Ecumenical History Ready For Distribution This Spring**

A most important publishing event in ecumenical circles will be the appearance this Spring of the long-awaited *History of the Ecumenical Movement*, prepared in Geneva over a period of years under the editorial guidance of Bishop Stephen Neill and Miss Ruth Rouse, and under the sponsorship of the World Council of Churches. The 800-page volume covers the period from 1517 to the formation of the World Council of Churches in 1948. Its sixteen chapters have been written by such outstanding ecumenical authorities as W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Bishop Stephen Neill, and Adolph Keller; and

such well-known American historians as Kenneth Scott Latourette, John T. McNeill, Georges Florovsky, and Donald Yoder; as well as outstanding historians from Great Britain and the continent of Europe.

Although the history deals primarily with the period beginning with the rise of the Protestant Reformation in 1517 and ending with the formation of the World Council of Churches in 1948, a comprehensive survey of "Division and Search for Unity Prior to the Reformation" and an up-to-date evaluation of the ecumenical movement and its future make this book the definitive volume in the entire history of the ecumenical movement. The work is in two parts; the first, up to 1910, covering in outline almost four centuries, the second dealing in far greater detail with the events subsequent to 1910. A glossary and complete index are provided to help the student.

This book contains information never before made conveniently available, and indispensable to those who wish to follow the development of the contemporary ecumenical movement and to take part intelligently in it. Delegates to Evanston and other ecumenical meetings in particular will find that the book contains answers to many of their questions.

The book is now on the presses in Britain. In the United States it will be published by Westminster Press. Publication date here has been set at May 12, and the price at \$9.00. It can be ordered from the New York office of the World Council of Churches.

### **Swiss Youth Meets To Discuss Assembly**

Switzerland (EPS)—On January 23 and 24, all the church and free-church youth associations of German and French Switzerland met together for the first time in the well-known youth center at Vaumarcus, on the lake of Neuchatel. This meeting brought together 40 leaders of Swiss Protestant youth work, who are preparing Protestant youth for the Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held at Evanston this summer.

Switzerland has been asked to send two youth delegates to this Assembly. The main theme of the Assembly, "Christ — the Hope of the World" was dealt with by Pastor Girardet (Lausanne) in his Bible study and in a short report by Pastor Mobbs (Geneva). The six subsidiary themes, which examine the practical problems of the Churches, were described in short reports followed by discussions, on the actual significance of these problems for contemporary youth. Different groups dealt further with the problem of how to bring closer to the members of the youth associations the chief concern of the Assembly — the unity of the Church of Christ and its social responsibility.

### **Complete Survey of Training Of the Ministry in Africa**

During the past six months an international, inter-denominational team of experts has been making a survey for the IMC and the Africa Committee of the Divi-

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion  
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT  
*Co-Chairmen*

M. SEARLE BATES LISTON POPE  
ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN WILLIAM SCARLETT  
F. ERNEST JOHNSON HENRY P. VAN DUSEN  
AMOS N. WILDER

MARION HAUSNER, *Secretary*

## CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER HENRY SMITH LEIPER  
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN JOHN A. MACKAY  
CHARLES W. GILKEY FRANCIS P. MILLER  
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH EDWARD L. PARSONS  
UMPHREY LEE

sion of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Training for the Ministry in Latin Africa under the chairmanship of Dr. Searle Bates (Disciple) of the Union Theological Seminary. Other members of the team were Dr. Bengt Sundkler (Lutheran) of the Uppsala University, Sweden; Professor Christian G. Baeta of the University College of the Gold Coast, Achimota, Africa (Presbyterian); Professor Frank Michaeli of the Paris Theological Faculty, Paris, France (Reformed). Dr. Bates returned to New York on December 18th having spent two weeks in London completing a preliminary report. The findings of the survey will undoubtedly make an important contribution to plans for the revamping of the system of theological education in Latin Africa at a very critical time in the

life of that continent. It will no doubt introduce a new era of cooperation among the more than one hundred missions from eight countries working in tropical Africa.

Dr. Norman Goodall of the London office of the IMC, and Mr Erik Nielsen, Research Secretary for the IMC, have completed a third stage of the study in Southern Africa. The first stage was conducted by Bishop Stephen Neill in British East and West Africa. An integrated report of the three stages covering the whole of Africa south of the Sahara will be published in one volume, edited by Dr. Bengt Sundkler of Uppsala University, Sweden.

## German Church Rally Planned In Spite of Communist Ban

Neuendettelsau, Germany (NLC)—In spite of the Soviet authorities' ban of the annual German Evangelical Church rally (Kirchentag) from Leipzig, attempts will be made to hold the church rally next summer "somewhere" in East Germany it was announced here. According to the information office of the Lutheran World Federation, Dr. Reinhold von Thadden, president of the Kirchentag, told a meeting here that the officers of the rally have decided that the Kirchentag "should in any event take place in the German East Zone in 1954."

According to an earlier decision, the Kirchentag, which every year rallies members of the Evangelical Church in Germany from all parts of the country, should alternately be held in the East and the West Zones. Originally the 1954 rally was planned for Leipzig in the East Zone, and the authorities of that zone had given tentative approval of the plans. However that approval was recently withdrawn.

At the meeting here, Dr. Thadden stressed that the Church "cannot allow outside forces to dictate its program" and added that if the rally could not be held in Leipzig "a Kirchentag of a special kind might be held somewhere else in the German Democratic Republic (East Zone) late in the autumn." Dr. Thadden's message, as reported by the LWF information office, did not indicate how the Kirchentag organizers proposed to arrange the "special kind of Kirchentag" in spite of the Soviet authorities' ban.

REB MR 10  
*We have received 200 new subscribers to Christianity and Crisis through the names suggested to us by old subscribers. This success prompts us to suggest that subscribers who have not sent in names of friends who might be interested in our journal might do so now. We would be most grateful for this help in extending the circle of our readers.*

Detroit Public Library  
Book Receiving Dept.  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-54

## Author In This Issue

Frank S. Ketcham is Chairman of the Christian Citizenship Committee of the Council for Social Action.